THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN — FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY — KEVIN ROCHE
ELI S. JACOBS — EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

December 11, 1979

AM
10:00 CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

1. ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of next meetings: Jaunary 8, 1980
February 12, 1980

B. Approval of Minutes: September 20, 1979
October 23, 1979

C. Symposium on the National Capital, Secretary of the Interior, Cecil Andrus, Dumbarton Oaks, November 12 & 13, 1979 - report

11. SUBMISSIONS

A. D.C. Department of Economic Development, Old Georgetown Act

1. OG 80-6 3020 K Street, N.W. Western Development Proposal, Georgetown Waterfront, preliminary design.

2. OG 79-178 1609-11 31st Street, N.W. Demolition of two apartment buildings - resubmission

3. OG 80-12 1609-11 31st Street, N.W. Revised Preliminary designs for eight new residences, Tudor Walk

4. Appendix A

B. D.C. Department of Economic Development, Shipstead-Luce Act

1. SL 80-8 613-625 15th Street, N.W. Revised design for alterations and additions to the Keith-Albee and the Metropolitan buildings.

2. SL 80-3 555 4th Street, N.W. New office building, Judiciary Square, preliminary designs.

3. SL 80-7 601 18th Street, N.W., (previously 1777 F St., N.W.) New office building, existing facades at 18th and F Streets to be retained and/or replaced, Michler Place detailed drawings and material samples review.

4. Appendix B

C. D.C. Department of General Services

1. CFA-12-11-79-1 Lamont-Riggs Branch Library, South Dakota, Jefferson & Kennedy St., N.E., Design review

2. CFA-12-11-79-2 D.C. Civic Center, consideration of final exterior material samples

D. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

1. CFA-12-11-79-4 Pershing Park, 15th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Final plans

2. CFA-12-11-79-5 Willard Hotel, 14th and Pennsylvania Avenue, Schematic plans, Informal presentation

E. National Park Service, National Capital Region

CFA-12-11-79-6 Freedom Bell, Union Station-National Visitors Center, Columbus Plaza - revised designs

F. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

1. CFA-12-11-79-3 Robert F. Kennedy National Medal, designs

2. CFA-12-11-79-7 Hubert H. Humphrey Medal, design

3. CFA-12-11-79-8 Transatlantic Ballonist Medal, revised designs

APPENDIX I

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

December 11, 1979

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
* O.G. 79-108 HPA. 79-235	1023 31st Street, N.W. Theodore Manousakis	New 5 story office/commercial building.

ACTION: Issue permit. Board reviewed working drawings. Request that on site brick sample be submitted for approval of and inspection.

---

* O.G. 79-149 HPA. 79-438	2906 O Street, N.W. Mt. Zion Methodist Church	Razed building, for determination of eligibility only.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Consideration of economic hardship through public hearing process and exploration of public and private assistance may be desirable. Age and historic associations may be unique in Georgetown and must be carefully evaluated before any disposition of this property.

---

* O.G. 79-150 HPA. 79-440	3608 Reservoir Road, N.W. Convent Gardens Corporation	Raze existing building.

ACTION: Issue permit for interim renovation and eventual demolition.

O.G. 79-151 HPA. 79-437	Multiple addresses	Replace wood siding and shutters with aluminum siding to match existing siding.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Site inspection indicated that aluminum siding would be inappropriate and unnecessary. Recommend owners repaint existing wood siding. Additional professional advise on restoration and painting process may be advisable.

APPENDIX 1

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

December 11, 1979

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
* O.G. 79-152 HPA. 79-441	1855 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Safeway Stores Inc.	Raze building.

ACTION: Issue permit.

---

* O.G. 79-160 HPA. 79-489	3276 M Street, N.W. Market House Company	Repaint building & install accent lighting and side awnings, new curb, sidewalks and patio in rear of building. Note brick will be cleaned, repointed and sealed with an approved restoration masonry cleaner if possible

ACTION: Issue permit. Recommend Glidden's "Lafayette Blue," for the doors and wood cornice, "Shutter Green," or "Montrose Green," for the window sash, "Francis Dodge Cream," for surrounds, and Washington Shade and Awning Co."Deep Green," number 6901 as exhibited by the developer for the awning. The developer will be presenting a simplified design for the stepped marketing podium and will make a study incorporating bracket lights attached to the building front which should reflect the geometry of the existing trefoil transom windows.

O.G. 79-164 HPA. 79-499	3020 K Street, N.W. Western Development	New Construction: Retail-Commercial-Residential-Garage.

ACTION: O.G. 80-6 supercedes O.G. 79-164.

O.G. 79-169 HPA. 80-12	3421 Dent Place, N.W. Jon Tilley	Replace existing damaged walls parging over block to match parging of the house.

ACTION: Issue permit. Design and choice of material is consistent with existing residence.

APPENDIX 1

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

December 11, 1979

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 79-171 HPA. 80-24	3401 N Street, N.W. Allen Novak	Erection of new fence to replace existing.

ACTION: Issue permit. Design and choice of materials are appropriate.

O.G. 79-172 HPA. 80-25	1411 27th Street, N.W. Charles F.D. Egberta	Addition of window.

ACTION: Issue permit. New window in present garage opening will not affect integrity of existing facade.

O.G. 79-173 HPA. 80-35	3616 N Street, N.W. Dr. Bressette	Build new rear steps and deck as shown as well as a new party wall.

ACTION: Issue permit. Design and choice of material are consistent with existing residence. Recommend installation of plant material to improve existing appearance of concrete wall.

O.G. 79-174 HPA. 80-34	1683 32nd Street, N.W. mr. and Mrs. W.T. Fleming	Completely enclose existing areaway, renovate rear wall of house with 3' - 6" window/door bay

ACTION: Issue permit. Design for new bay window and door are an appropriate improvement to existing structure.

APPENDIX I

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

December 11, 1979

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
* O.G. 79-175 HPA. 80-37	3500-3700 Reservoir Road, N.W. Convent Garden Corporation	Site plan.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Site plan is approved pending submission for review and approval by the CFA of drawings and model showing proposed residential designs, topographical scheme and landscape treatment, incorporating existing trees where possible.

O.G. 79-176 HPA. 80-47	1640 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Pat W. McKenny	Sign to be made of 10 mill Lexan clear polycarbonate with suede finish. Subsurface graphics, screen printed in two colors burgundy and beige laminated to 1/8" plexiglass. Total size 48" x 30".

ACTION: Issue permit for 24" x 36" sign to be framed by 2" wood surround.

O.G. 79-177 HPA. 80-48	3222 N Street, N.W. The Mole Hole	8' x 18" flat sign. and a 2' x 2' hanging sign

ACTION: Issue permit for free-standing, pin mounted letters on existing facsia panel in conformance with attached modified sketch. "Mole" logo figure to be maximum height of 14" and confined to panel with no overlap. Additional projecting sign is not recommended.

O.G. 80-1 HPA. 80-79	3405 R Street, N.W. Mr. Raymond Dickey	Exterior alterations: enclose 2 rear porches, remove front porch to railing.

ACTION: Issue permit for enclosure of rear porch.

O.G. 80-2 HPA. 80-82	1729 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. D.C. National Bank	Application of white aluminum cut-out letters stud mounted into brick. White aluminum logo cut-out.

ACTION: Issue permit for new, white-enameled, aluminum cut-out sign.

APPENDIX I

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

December 11, 1979

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 80-3 HPA. 80-83	1603 34th Street, N.W. Edmund Bartlet	Addition of in rear areaway, sliding doors in rear on 1st and 2nd floor.

ACTION: Issue permit for rear closures and new openings.

	NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
*	O.G. 80-10 HPA. 80-96	1001 34th Street, N.W. Donohoe Company	Excavation for and installation of sheeting shoring and foundations to grade.

ACTION: Issue permit for excavation in conformity with approved preliminary designs.

	NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
*	O.G. 79-168 HPA. 80-11	3058 K Street, N.W.	Raze piece by piece all concrete silos and masonry building.

ACTION: Issue permit.

APPENDIX 2

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

December 11,1979

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 79-103 HPA. 79-482	239 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E. Thomas Robbins	Install canvas canopy for front of restaurant.

ACTION: Issue permit.

S.L. 79-107 HPA. 80-21	1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Cabot, Cabot, and Forbes	Sign application.

ACTION: Issue permit for temporary 3' x 5' construction sign.

S.L. 79-109	7742 16th Street, N.W. Dr. R.L. Hackney	Porch enclosure, roof and footings in place, double hung window.

ACTION: Issue permit for porch enclosure retaining existing roof. Appearance of siding to match existing and new window to be double hung to match existing sash below and to be centered.

S.L. 79-110	3419 Mt. Pleasant Street, N.W. Reid Willis	Repair porch, roof and footings in place.

ACTION: Issue permit for repair of porch, retaining existing roof. Wood columns to match existing and lattice to screen underside of porch recommended.

S.L. 79-111	4719 Blagden Terrace, N.W. Edward Cardwell	Porch enclosure, roof and footings in place.

ACTION: Issue permit for revised drawing showing double hung windows to match front of house.

APPENDIX 2

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

December 11, 1979

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
S.L. 79-112	126 3rd Street, N.W. Haven N.B. Pell	Remove existing double hung windows on 1st floor facade, replace with bay window.

ACTION: Issue permit.

---

*	S.L. 79-113	1777 F Street, N.W. Burka Properties Inc.	Demolish existing structures on site except south & west wall of corner townhouse, restone south & west wall of corner townhouse & build new structure on site.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Request presentation of working drawings, landscape plans, exact material samples and details for review and approval by the CFA. Recommend additional color study to insure harmony witnin immediate neighborhood. Commission commends concept of blending old and new architectural elements.

---

*	S.L. 79-115	1426 G Street, N.W. Oliver Carr and Beorge Beuchert	Retain facade along 15th Street.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Preliminary designs for altering existing building are approved. Request presentation of working drawings, material samples and details for review and approval by the CFA.

---

*	S.L. 79-116	613 15th Street, N.W. Carr and Beuchert	Retain facade to depth of 20 feet. remainder new construction.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Preliminary designs for altering existing building are approved. Request presentation of working drawings, material samples and details for review and approval by the CFA.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

December 11, 1979

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
* S.L. 79-117	613 and 625 15th Street, N.W. Square 224 Associates	New construction-office-retail building.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Recommend additional study of sight lines from the intersections of F and G Street at 15th Street to reduce visual effect of new structure rising above the Keith-Albee and Metropolital Bank facades. Concept approved subject to public hearing on proposed light courts.

---

* S.L. 79-118	55 Ivy Street, S.E. Canal and Ivy Association	Construction of new office building.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Request presentation of working drawings, material samples, landscape treatment and additional study of east elevation for review and approval by the CFA. Suggest combination of small window and strip windows to diminish & modify scale.

S.L. 79-119	1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. American Security Bank	Change existing sign to 2 aluminum signs to read "American Security Bank," with logo shield

ACTION: Issue permit. No objection to changing text on existing sign.

S.L. 79-122	734 15th Street, N.W. 734 Limited Partnership	Remove existing windows and install new ones.

ACTION: Issue permit for new bronze door and window.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY
ELI S. JACOBS
FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
KEVIN ROCHE
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

11 December 1979

The meeting was convened at 10:15 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Members Present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Philip W. Buchen Hon. Victorine DuPont Homsey Hon. Frederick D. Nichols Hon. Kevin Roche Hon. Edward D. Stone, Jr.
Georgetown Board Member Present:	Mr. Thomas D. Wright
Staff Present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue Kohler Miss Karen O'Meara
National Capital Planning Commission Staff Present:	George Evans

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of next meeting approved as: 8 January 1980
12 February 1980

B. Minutes of 20 September and 23 October 1979 meetings, approved.

C. Symposium on the National Capital, Secretary of the Interior Cecil Andrus. Dumbarton Oaks, 12 & 13 November; report. The Secretary noted for the record that he had attended the meetings and that the Chairman had chaired one of the panels. He said a transcript had been made and would be available to the members. The Chairman commented that it had been an encouraging meeting of minds on the visual aspects of Washington, and noted the general agreement among those participating that it would be extremely helpful to have someone on the White House staff concerned with Washington affairs. He also reported that these meetings might be held on a regular basis in the future.

II. SUBMISSIONS

A. District of Columbia Government, Department of Housing and Economic Development

Old Georgetown Act

1. O.G. 80-6, 3020 K Street, N.W., Western Development proposal, Georgetown waterfront, preliminary design. The Assistant Secretary first introduced James Gibson, the Mayor's Assistant Administrator for Planning and Development, who reviewed the efforts of the Georgetown Waterfront Task Force to date. He mentioned other studies completed over the past two decades, including that of Senator Mathias, which called for a park from the river up to the C & O Canal. He said that when the Senator realized that there was not sufficient support in Congress for the purchase of this large amount of land, he got together a task force, consisting of representatives from several Federal and District government agencies as well as citizen's groups, to work out a solution which would provide the maximum public benefit with minimum government expense. He said that after two years' discussion, a plan had been formulated and an agreement signed in the summer of 1979 by officials of the Federal and District governments and the developer. Mr. Gibson stated that in his opinion this plan achieves the best possible balance between the interests of the governments involved, the citizens, and the developer. The agreement was based on several assumptions, which Mr. Gibson believes are still valid: (1) the Whitehurst Freeway and the stump of the Potomac River Freeway will remain; (2) there are no local funds available to purchase land; and (3) there are no Federal funds. He said that while he is aware that the Commission would prefer that the waterfront south of K Street be devoted solely to park use, the Commission's function requires that it give careful consideration to the proposals to be presented. He noted also that this plan does provide for a park, a strip 160 feet deep along the entire waterfront from Key Bridge to Rock Creek, which will require no expenditures by the local or Federal governments since the agreement provides for some land swapping with the developer and the closing of certain streets. Mr. Gibson closed by stressing the lessening of the developer's rights under present zoning laws that has been achieved by the task force agreement--about 50% according to figures. Mr. Nichols questioned the effect on Georgetown of the increased traffic generated by this project. Mr. Gibson replied that since the development rights have been reduced by 50%, the traffic would also be substantially reduced, and added that he felt the real problem in Georgetown is commuter traffic. He said, however, that a traffic study is underway.

The next speaker was Robert Mendelsohn, assistant to the Secretary of the Interior. He commented on the Secretary's interest in the city of Washington as evidenced by his investigation of Federal legal action in the Rosslyn high-rise case, his involvement with PADC, and now with the Georgetown waterfront problem. Mr. Mendelsohn said the Park Service had been asked to cooperate with NCPC and citizens' groups in arriving at a workable solution to the waterfront problem, so that the "green necklace" of parkland along the entire city waterfront would no longer be broken. He said it was the Secretary's feeling that when, out of the 18 acres in question

along the Georgetown waterfront, 12 will remain parkland according to the agreement and present proposal, it seems excessive to spend 23-25 million dollars to buy the whole parcel and add only 6 more acres of parkland.

The Chairman asked how much Interior is willing to put into the development of the park along the waterfront. Mr. Mendelsohn replied that the expected development would be very "soft"--bike paths, benches, grass, and bulkhead work--and that out of a total expected expenditure of 13-15 million, most of this would be devoted to work on the bulkhead.

Both the Chairman and Mr. Roche questioned Mr. Mendelsohn about what kind of assurance had been given that this work would be accomplished. He answered that while there was no formal commitment as such, the Secretary has signed the agreement, which implied his commitment. Mr. Stone asked it the developer would pay for any of the park work, including the bulkhead, since he will benefit from the improvements. Mr. Mendelsohn said the developer will pay for a visitors' center and perhaps other improvements; this would have to be worked out more fully.

George Oberlander spoke for the Planning Commission, stating that this body has seen the proposal and will consider it only to the extent that it is a Federal undertaking; that is, it will review the park only--its extent, creation and type of development. The building project review is not within that Commission's jurisdiction as it does not involve the Federal Government.

The next speaker was the developer, Herbert Miller. Mr. Miller said that in partnership with Chessie Resources he had worked with the task force to produce a development in which the permissible height and density had been reduced by 50%. He noted that his project would screen the freeway, that it was unified in design, and that through the use of setbacks and the breaking up of masses it achieved the look of a village. Unlike the nearby Watergate apartments, it would be closely integrated with the water through pedestrian easements. He said the project is now 60% residential and that most of this would be away from the freeway.

Mr. Miller was followed by Joseph Brown from EDAW, planning consultants. Mr. Brown showed slides of the project, pointing out and explaining elements that would keep the Georgetown character and help open the street fabric to the waterfront.

Mr. Miller returned to discuss adjustments he would be willing to make to meet the recommendation of the Georgetown Board, which had seen the project before this Commission meeting and issued a report to the Commissioners. He stated first that he is actually donating 12 million dollars in value to the District through his willingness to forego full development on the site, and that he would also build the visitors' center and grade and seed the park site until the Park Service develops it. He would be willing to make the following concessions to meet the Georgetown Board's objections: (1) Remove the residential connections over the north-south streets and replace them with glazed passageways at the freeway level; (2) Widen the pedestrian openings at these streets from 30 to 35-40 feet, plus terrace the building back as it rises; creating an opening up to 60 feet wide in

some places; (3) Remove one floor. This would be the most difficult concession, but would make the total height 70-71 feet. (4) Terrace the residential space facing the freeway back in 6 foot setbacks.

Mr. Miller concluded by saying that he is in a very difficult position and would like to make any necessary adjustments at this time in order to get preliminary approval. He said he plans to bring in other architects and residential consultants as the design develops.

Thomas Wright was asked to comment on the Georgetown Board's reaction to this project. He prefaced his remarks by saying that the Board would much prefer an all park scheme, but had reviewed this project in the absence of any assurance that funds for purchase of the land would be forthcoming. He said that the Board was most concerned with the views from Georgetown and the fact that many of these would be blocked by the narrow street openings and pedestrian bridges. He thought the sheer wall of the residential floors above the freeway was forbidding, and repeated the Board's suggestion that one floor of this should be removed, the rest stepped back, and the sections over the north-south streets be removed. He also expressed the hope that the development of the park would not be too "soft", as Mr. Mendelsohn had put it.

There were perhaps a dozen citizens present, some of whom asked to make statements. The Chairman welcomed their comments, but asked that statements not duplicate ideas already expressed and that each person limit his statement to 3 minutes.

Charles Poor, president of the Citizens' Association of Georgetown, read the first statement. He reviewed the various studies made for the waterfront and said that recent events, specifically the Hatfield and Stark bills in Congress and the agreement referred to by Mr. Gibson, had sharpened the issue. He said the Citizens' Association had worked with the task force originally to effect some sort of compromise when it appeared that no funds were available for land purchase. However, support was withdrawn when it became apparent that the scale of the development had increased enormously and the park would be only a front yard for the project, in spite of assurances to the contrary. He said the validity of this assessment has been borne out by the model and drawings presented, and the Citizens' Association is now formally urging disapproval.

The next speaker was Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe, chairman of the Committee of One Hundred and former chairman of the Planning Commission. She said she was in disagreement with the present chairman of the Planning Commission and the task force on the matter of the waterfront, and appalled by the model--especially by the very narrow, dark entrances through which one gets only a glimpse of the water. The proposed narrow park with limited access would really not serve the public, she said, and on this most historic, national river a real waterfront park should be created. She noted also that there is an easement held by the Park Service on part of the Chessie System land which limits development to one story.

The Chairman questioned Mr. Miller about this; he said he was aware of

it and pointed out the area to which it applies. The Chairman commented at this point that while Mr. Miller may not be developing the land to the fullest extent allowed by law, economic benefits will accrue to him by reason of the Park Service's development and maintenance of the waterfront park, Roosevelt Island and the view from the project of river edges as parkland, and from the ambiance of the historic district of Georgetown itself. Mr. Miller replied that if the Commission is not pleased with this project, he will be happy to go back to one based on his full zoning rights. The chairman said in that event the Old Georgetown Act would still apply any any new design would also have to be reviewed.

Mrs. Rowe then concluded her statement by saying that the Committee of One Hundred, a citizen group which has the distinction of being the oldest planning organization in Washington, unanimously supports the Hatfield and Stark bills to provide funds for a total park and hopes that the Commission of Fine Arts will oppose this project.

Grosvenor Chapman, architect, representing the Citizens' Association of Georgetown, was the next speaker. He stated first that the waterfront issue is a very important one as it involves the historic value of all Georgetown. He then commented on the importance of this waterfront when viewed from outside Georgetown, specifically from the Kennedy Center, Roosevelt Island and the Lincoln Memorial. He showed a slide to point out that it is also very visible from Washington Circle. Mr. Chapman said there are several alternatives for dealing with this part of Georgetown, now in such an unattractive condition: One is the very heavy use of the land for commercial and residential purposes, as seen in Mr. Miller's proposal; a second would be an attempt to reconstruct the port area as it was in the town's early days. This he did not see as a likely or really desirable prospect. The third and by far the best would be to create a park for the use of all citizens; in this solution no man-made structures would be involved and there would be no problem of relating them to the old buildings in the rest of Georgetown. Mr. Chapman said the 160 foot wide strip only pays lip service to a park; he would like to see the waterfront devetoped as a wooded area similar to that along Independence Avenue between the Lincoln Memorial and the Tidal Basin.

Mr. Chapman commented next on the disastrous effect the commercial part of this development will have on Georgetown. He foresees it acting as a magnet, drawing crowds of people into a small town already filled to capacity, a town characterized by limited access and narrow streets and sidewalks. He said it will bring a 47% increase in commercial footage and draw people away from the established shops on Wisconsin Avenue, the traditional shopping street, causing economic hardship and thus a deterioration of the historic structures on that street. As to the difficulty of funding the purchase of the land, Mr. Chapman said the District apparently had no difficulty finding 30 million dollars for improving the Whitehurst freeway. In regard to the theory that Mr. Miller's project would hide the freeway, he said that hiding one incompatible structure with another could not be considered an improvement.

Ann Satterthwaite, a recreation counselor, stressed that citizens

from the nearby areas of Dupont Circle and Foggy Bottom needed the additional recreational space that a waterfront park could provide. She noted that the property in question is the only wide piece of riverfront land left, and that it had been designated as park land by NCPC. She referred to the proposed project as "a cinder in the emerald necklace" of Washington's riverfront parks.

Lawrence M. Stevens from the Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission, cautioned against building on a flood plain and argued that the proposed megastructure is a short-sighted approach.

Donald Shannon, representing the ANC, reviewed the history of this piece of land and its scenic views and urged that the present proposal, which disregards these aspects, be disapproved.

Katherine Sullivan stressed that the Hatfield-Stark legislation is a serious proposal and said that hearings will be held as soon as is practicable. She said the task force agreement was signed without consideration of environmental issues and that several Senators and Congressmen had urged that environmental impact statements be made available. She also pointed out that this area is one of the few left suitable for the placement of a memorial and that this might be tied in with a park.

When all the citizens had been heard, the Chairman said the Commission would now have to confine itself to a discussion of the project before it, as submitted, on the assumption that something would be built on the site, even though the Commission's strong preference was for park development of the whole waterfront. Mr. Roche asked if by considering it the Commission could be interpreted as giving legitimacy to the project. Mr. Buchen thought the members had to consider it and act on it; otherwise, the 45 day time limit might expire (the time given in the Old Georgetown Act for the Commission to make its report) and the Commission would have no say in what was built. He thought, however, that the members could certainly state their preference for a park on the site if funds become available.

The Chairman began the discussion with some observations. He noted that the Commission was functioning under a dual responsibility here--under its mandate to review plans for Federal parks in the Capital, and under the Old Georgetown Act, by which it reviews plans for private structures in the historic district. He admitted that it would be difficult to find the proper image for any development on this site since it was never part of the residential fabric to the north, but was the port area of the town and served a function which no longer exists. He thought that perhaps the project should be keyed not to Georgetown, but to the river's bend and the major structures nearby--the Watergate development and the Kennedy Center. As submitted, he felt that the project was too "nervous" and attempted the impossible--a megastructure which is at the same time a hillside Mediterranean fishing village with an English Georgian style. He was also unhappy with the vast expanses of brick and thought something similar to Moshe Safde's projects might be better, or perhaps just warehouse type structures, such as existed in the port days. He said the Commission could not go along with the task force's stress on architectural unity. Some relief is

needed in a project of this size; possibly the use of more than one designer might help, for different parts of the site. He said he appreciated the developer's ofer to comply with the Georgetown Board's recommendation but that scale remains the essential problem. He offered the Commission's help to the developer in any way possible to overcome this.

Mr. Roche said it is not possible to apply design to a wrong assumption and come up with anything acceptable. He criticized the building as being too large, having no scale and being "bogus Georgetown" in style. He deplored the relentless use of brick and the attempt to soften the effect by the liberal scattering of greenery all over the model, greenery which he said rarely appears in actuality, and if it does is seldom maintained. He did not think that the use of more than one designer would solve the problem; he said that what the project needs is a competent architect.

Mr. Nichols said that the difficulties are so apparent in the project presented that all those concerned should press even harder for a park.

The Chairman said that a project of this size belongs downtown, an area now undergoing extensive redevelopment. He thought the city should put its efforts there, not into Georgetown. He feared too much attention to Georgetown will result in "killing the goose that laid the golden egg".

Mr. Miller then asked if the Commission would give him a critique of the 1973 Inland Steel waterfront project, approved by the Commission, so that he would know in which direction to proceed. Mr. Roche commented that the Commission is a design review body, not a design body, and that it is never wise for it to become involved in actual design. What it needs is to be presented with a well-designed project it can comment on. Mr. Stone said there is no point in turning the clock back to 1973. He said Mr. Miller had already received very specific guidance at this meeting, and then repeated his observation that the scale of the project, as presented, was much too large.

As the discussion ended, Mr. Miller asked if he could get a decision on street closings. Mr. Buchen and the Chairman told him that his question is not within the Commission's jurisdiction. The project, as presented, was unanimously disapproved. The Commission resolved that recommendations in accordance with the foregoing points of discussion raised by members be reported to the Government of the District of Columbia. EXHIBITS A,A-1

2. O.G. 79-178, 1609-11 31st Street, N. W. Demolition of two apartment buildings--resubmission.

3. O.G. 80-12, 1609-11 31st Street, N. W. Revised preliminary designs for eight new residences, Tudor Walk. The Assistant Secretary reviewed the Commission's previous comments on this project and the disapproval of a permit to raze the buildings on the site until something more suited to the streetscape was offered in their place. Specific criticisms were directed towards the cutting of the berm to allow for garage entrances and to the design of the houses themselves. Mr. Wright said the Georgetown

Board felt that the new designs submitted was much improved and would not disturb the berm; he said the Board would be willing to grant a demolition permit if the Commission approved the architectural and site plans. He asked, however, that the Board did not like the oversized bricks in the sample submitted by the architect, Charles Soulé. The Commission members agreed with this and also objected to the porches as being more characteristic of country, rather than town houses. Other than these reservations, the designs were considered acceptable, subject to modification after further review by the Georgetown Board. The demolition of the existing buildings was approved.

4. Appendix A, approved.

B. District of Columbia Government, Department of Housing and Economic Development

Shipstead-Luce Act

1. S.L. 80-8, 613-25 15th Street, N.W. Revised design for alterations and additions to the Keith-Albee and Metropolitan Bank buildings. Staff member Jeffrey Carson described the changes made in this project since the last submission, notably the additional 10 feet added to the setback of the new construction above the Keith-Albee and Metropolitan Bank buildings on 15th Street. He introduced David Childs of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, architects, who said that because of this further setback, the new construction would not be visible from 15th Street in front of the Treasury building. The elevator penthouses, although taller, will be much further back and therefore not visible. Mr. Childs said that other than this change, the design has remained much the same, with the exception of a few refinements, notably an ornamental iron balcony railing at the 3rd and 10th floor openings. When asked about materials, he said limestone is still the first choice, with cast stone second if limestone proves too expensive.

The members considered the increased setback of the top floors satisfactory and tentative approval was given to the preliminary design, pending the outcome of the hearing on the demolition of Rhodes Tavern.

2. S.L. 80-3, 555 4th Street, N.W. New office building, Judiciary Square, preliminary design. The Assistant Secretary introduced Mr. John Samperton, architect, who discussed his design for this building on Judiciary Square. He said that in designing the building he had considered its relationship to an existing church on the block as well as to the other major buildings on the Square. The material is expected to be limestone. In response to a question from Mr. Stone regarding the reason for placing the street trees in tubs, Mr. Samperton said he had done this because a basement running under the paved area in front precluded the normal planting. There were no other questions and the preliminary design was approved.

3. S.L. 80-7, 601 18th Street, N.W. (previously 1777 F Street, N.W.) New office building, existing facades at 18th and F Streets to be retained and / or replaced; Michler Place, detailed drawings and material samples review. David Childs from Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, architects, was introduced and told the members that the metal siding originally chosen for

this project had proved too costly, and his firm had decided on a polished Brazilian granite, dark green in color. The color was chosen to play up the red and green color scheme seen in Mrs. Robert Low Bacon's red brick house across the street with its backdrop of dark green trees. (The old Michler Row town houses incorporated into this project will be painted brick red.) Mr. Roche and the Chairman both considered the color too dark, with Mr. Roche commenting that it would read like a shiny black building, which might be all right in New York but out of place in Washington where the buildings (other than brick) are light in hue. Mr. Nichols suggested a grey granite, and Mr. Childs said that although they had already considered several grey samples and found them unsatisfactory, they would try again. The members unanimously agreed that further research into a lighter colored material was necessary and disapproved the sample submitted. The working drawings were approved.

4. Appendix B, approved.

C. D.C. Department of General Services.

1. CFA 12-11-79-1 Lamont-Riggs Branch Library, South Dakota, Jefferson and Kennedy Streets, N.E., design review. Mr. Carson discussed the design of this building, noting that interior spaces will recieve natural light from skylights. He introduced Charles Pavlick from the District Government who asked that any questions be directed to Mr. Carillo from the firm of Bryant and Bryant, architects. There were no questions and the design was approved with material samples to be submitted later. EXHIBIT B

2. CFA 12-11-79-2 D.C. Civic Center, consideration of final exterior material samples. Mr. Carson recalled the Commission's approval in July of the preliminary design for this building, with the request that the architects submit a warmer toned concrete sample and adjust the colors of the other materials to harmonize. Mr. Pavlick of the District Government then asked Robert Henley from the architectural firm of Welton Becket and Associates to discuss the samples submitted. The members agreed that the concrete, glass and metal samples were acceptable in color, but the Chairman thought the paver was too purplish in tone; he said the Commission would like to see samples of this material laid out so the effect could be judged. He suggested Mr. Henley contact PADC about their research on various kinds and colors of paving materials. Mr. Stone asked about street trees; Mr. Henley said there are some existing, and he realized that any new ones would have to be tall varieties to match the scale of the building. EXHIBIT C

D. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation.

1. CFA 12-11-79-4 Pershing Park, 15th and Pennsylvania Avenue N.W., final plans. Mr. Charles Gueli from PADC told the members that there had been no changes, only a completion of the design of the special features, specifically, the water element in the pool and the kiosk. The water element, 13 x 35 x 11 feet high, would be faced with flame finished granite, and the door to the storage area for the skating rink machinery would be flush with the surface, instead of recessed as before. The kiosk, unchanged in design, will be 20 feet high and 10 feet in diameter. Paving for the

area will be granite, with a darker tone being used for the memorial floor and walls and the water element in the pool. Honey locust trees are planned for the bosque, with willow oaks on the perimeter, birch surrounding the water area, and beech for the specimen trees in the memorial area.

Lighting on 14th and 15th Streets will be of the decorative type, while Pennsylvania Avenue and 15th Street will also have the high mast light. Within the park, ground lighting will be used to shine up into the trees. In discussing the material for the pool bottom and sides, Mr. Gueli said that granite cannot be used because of cracking problems in the winter, so the members suggested that perhaps just the top four inches of the sides could be faced with this material for the sake of appearance. The final designs were approved. EXHIBIT D

2. CFA 12-11-79-5 Willard Hotel, 14th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Schematic plans, informal presentation. This project was presented for information only by Mr. Malcom Holzmann of the firm Hardy, Holzmann, Pfeiffer, architects. He told the members that the preliminary design is complete and it is expected that design development will begin in January with construction in late summer or fall. He said interior work by his firm will consist of designing the ground floor spaces. These will be stripped and restored, in most respects, to their original appearance. He showed renderings of the lobby, Peacock Alley, the Willard Crystal rooms, and a new smaller lobby. The hotel will have 600 rooms.

The exterior of the building is in poor condition and will need major work. It is hoped that the paint can be removed from the light-colored brick, leaving the original appearance of a building with a limestone base, brick main section, and slate mansard. There will be a 30-40 foot wide street next to the old building, lined with shops, which will connect F Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. West of this will be the new addition, connsisting of "small Willards", similar to the old building in general style but not in detail. Mr. Holzmann said his firm is investigating the possibility of using terra cotta facing with a slight lustre for the new addition. Roofs will be copper.

The members were all pleased with this initial presentation, with the Chairman and Mr. Roche, particularly, congradulating Mr. Holzmann. EXHIBIT E

E. National Park Service, National Capital Region.

1. CFA 12-11-79-6 Freedom Bell, Union Station - National Visitors Center, Columbus Plaza; revised designs. The Assistant Secretary showed the members previous designs for the bell support--the traditional yoke and parabolic arch--and said that representatives of the Park Service and the American Legion, as well as the architect, Jack Patrick, were present to discuss a new design. Mr. Patrick showed the drawings and a small model of he revised design in which the bell was raised off the ground enough to make it appear as though it would swing; this had been suggested by the Commission at the previous presentation. The drawings showed a column steel support and a rectangular yoke, an abstraction of the traditional type with approximately the same proportions as the Liberty Bell yoke. The Chairman thought

the height of the yoke should be cut slightly, and the architect replied that this was his preference as well; otherwise, there were no objections and the design was approved with the promised reduction in height.

F. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

1. CFA 12-11-79-3 Robert F. Kennedy national medal, designs. Mr. Carson introduced Mr. George Schafer and Mr. Ray Myers of the Mint and then discussed the proposed Kennedy medal, which has been approved by the family. The obverse, a profile portrait of Kennedy, was designed by Michael Iococca; the reverse, the Justice Department seal, by Edgar Steever. Both artists are with the Philadelphia Mint. The medal will be issued in two sizes, 3 inches and 1 5/16 inches, and will be cast in gold for Mrs. Kennedy and bronze for public sale. The members were very pleased with the design, both obverse and reverse, and approved it. EXHIBIT F

2. CFA 12-11-79-7 Hubert H. Humphrey medal, design. This medal, to be issued in the 1 5/16 inch size only, showed a profile of Humphrey on the obverse, the work of John McCarthy of the Philadelphia Mint. The reverse had an inscription superimposed on a bas relief of the Capitol dome with the words "He Cared" at the bottom. The members questioned the addition of these words, but were told that the family had requested this. The only other comment made was that the lettering on the obverse crowded the head, and some adjustment should be made to avoid this. The Chairman suggested that Mr. Schafer bring the revised design to the staff for approval. EXHIBIT F

3. CFA 12-11-79-8 Transatlantic Ballonist medal, revised designs. In discussing this resubmission, Mr. Schafer said the ballonists wanted to keep their portraits on the obverse essentially as they were in the previous submission, based on their favorite photograph. To eliminate the awkwardness and confusion of the pose to which the members objected, the designer had faded the figures out at the bottom, instead of cutting them off sharply at the waist. This improved the design considerably, and this, plus the removal of the "Double Eagle" symbol from the reverse, made the design acceptable to everyone. EXHIBIT F

The meeting was adjourned at 3 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton,
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

December 7, 1979

Georgetown Waterfront Development

The Board of Architectural Consultants for Georgetown, at its meeting on 4 December 1979, met with representatives of the Western Development Corporation to review plans and models for a large scale commercial-residential development proposed for the Georgetown waterfront (O.C. 80-16). The site is bordered by K Street, the Wisconsin Avenue terminus, Rock Creek Park and the Potomac River.

Before addressing specific aspects of the proposed development, the Board wishes to affirm its support for proposals to establish a national park in the entire area between the Aqueduct Bridge abutments and Rock Creek Park, and from the south edge of K Street to the Potomac River. The inclusion of this land in Washington's riverfront park system will be of enormous value to the residents of this city by providing public recreational space --space which will be needed increasingly as the density of building in Georgetown and the rest of Washington increases. In addition, and this is of equal concern to the Board, such a park will do much to enhance Washington's beauty and dignity as the National Capital.

The sheer size of the Western Development proposal would be damaging to the appearance of Washington's shoreline. The building would stretch some 1200 feet along K Street, almost four city blocks long, or nearly half again as long as the largest museum structure on the Mall. Seen from down river, the mass of this structure would be somewhat reduced by the penetration of north-south streets and the necessary light courts. But even in the distant future when the landscaping has matured, the impact of the total mass would be formidable, dwarfing the Dodge Center by comparison.

The effect of the north side of the development, facing up the hill to the historic district of Georgetown, would be even more severe than the façade facing the river. At grade level, along K Street, it would present an almost continuous wall of building from 29th Street to Wisconsin Avenue. Coupled with the Whitehurst Freeway above and the anticipated development on the north side of K Street, this would produce a virtual tunnel. The only relief would be the narrow entrances to the project in line with 30th, Thomas Jefferson, and 31st Streets. While obviously a necessity, garage entrances and loading docks on K Street would not improve the dismal appearance of K Street under a highway structure that is recognized as one of the principal eyesores on the waterfront. Add to this an almost total lack of natural light, plus the largely solid north wall at grade level dictated by the hazard of flooding, and the result is not likely to be visually appealing.

EXHIBIT A

December 7, 1979
Georgetown Waterfront Development

Above the freeway conditions would not be much better. No breaks in the north elevation would be created by the north-south streets because the rights of way would be bridged over by two floors of residential construction, creating a continuous wall along the entire length of the project and allowing no view to the river. The undesirable effect of this closure would be even more noticeable farther up the hill toward M Street, particularly where 30th and 31st Streets cross over the C & O Canal. At the present time, the river can be seen clearly from both these locations, both under and over the freeway.

Moving down the hill, closer to K Street, the remaining view of the river would be seen in the current proposal through a narrow pathway only thirty feet wide -- half the width of the present rights-of-way. This view would be further constricted by low-hanging pedestrian bridges which span the streets in at least three locations, 30th Street being the most objectionable of these. The Board recommends that the pedestrian bridges and the connecting links on the upper stories be eliminated over all the public rights-of-way to the river. In addition, the proposed thirty foot width of these north-south openings should be doubled to match the sixty foot width of the present streets north of K Street. This would help to preserve the view of the Potomac that would otherwise be lost, and would also create a scale which would be somewhat less incompatible with that of the surrounding neighborhood.

Major modifications should also be made in the upper stories of the buildings, particularly adjoining the elevated Whitehurst Freeway. The floors at this level and above should be set back and articulated so as to reduce the impact and severity of the north wall. Planting of an appropriate scale and texture could then be placed on the resulting rooftop terraces. However, the Board questions the feasibility of extensive planting in these rooftop locations, given the occasional high winds and the limited planting depth available. The top floor should be elminated entirely, thus conforming to the maximum building height of sixty feet above grade which the Commission has recommended on projects north of K Street, and which has generally been adhered to.

The Board recognizes that these changes would reduce the overall rentable floor area of the project. Yet the Board believes that if the project is built these reductions are necessary in the public interest. Too much which is of potential public value is lost in the current plan, and whatever redeeming features this development has would not be enough to offset these losses.

In its present form it is a mega-structure that is out of keeping with its historic, environmental and scenic context. The Board recommends that it not be approved.

The Board of Architectural Consultants
for Georgetown

David N. Yerkes
Thurlow Austin Daniel
T. Wm. Wright

January 4, 1980

Dear Mr. Moore:

I am writing in regard to the Western Development Corporation's proposal for a large-scale commercial-residential complex on the Georgetown waterfront which the Commission considered at its meeting on December 11, 1979. The application, which was submitted for preliminary review under the Old Georgetown Act, was identified as O.G. 80-6 and listed the address of the development as 30.0 K Street, N.W.

After careful examination of the drawings and models, and after a lengthy discussion with parties both opposing and supporting the development, the Commission of Fine Arts has concluded that it cannot approve the project in its present form and recommends a thorough restudy of the design.

The Commission cannot stress too strongly the importance of this site visually to the city, as seen both from the side of the historic district and as part of the scenic riverfront, adjacent to major national parks and memorials. The location is highly visible from many important vantage points, including also major avenues and thoroughfares within the city, the parkways approaching the city, and the Potomac River itself.

The principal problem in the design lies in the sheer mass of the project, undifferentiated in its components, and attempting to quote superficial aspects of a "Georgetown" character that ends up giving the overall effect a nervousness that only underscores the incompatibility of a megastructure of that scale with the residential character of the historic district north of M Street. The use of brick in so large a project also fails for the same reason.

The specific recommendations of the Georgetown Board, a copy of whose report is attached, addressing four areas of improvement in the submission were endorsed by the Commission. The problem of basic architectural character is more serious, however, and the Commission urges the developer to take a fresh look at a different architectural approach, bearing in mind the interface with the city to the north of the project as well as the overall appearance from the river side.

EXHIBIT A-1

Finally, I should like to express the Commission's position, again shared by the Georgetown Board, favoring the development of a recreational park at this location. The Commission members wished the record of our meeting to show that they did not want their comments on the proposed design in any way to be interpreted as a lack of preference for the all park solution. In the Commission's view the needs of the citizens of this city and the values held by the country at large for the enhancement of the national capital will best be served by the development of this land as a park. We have said so on many previous occasions and feel we must reiterate this view for the serious consideration of the Mayor.

Meanwhile, if funding for such a solution is not forthcoming, we look forward to working with the developer closely to try to help the city come up with the best possible final design solution.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable
Robert L. Moore
Mayor's Agent for Historic Preservation
1350 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20576

JCB:ng

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY
ELI S. JACOBS
FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
ELVIN ROCH
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

December 14, 1979

Dear Mr. Pavlick:

The Commission of Fine Arts was happy to approve designs for the Lamond-Riggs Branch Library, (CFA 11/12/79-1) during its December meeting. The proposed design seems an excellent addition to the area of South Dakota, Jefferson and Kennedy Streets, N.E., and our hope is that the execution and landscaping can live up to the potential shown in the presentation drawings.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Charles Pavlick
Architect-Engineer
Liason Officer
Government of the District of Columbia
Department of General Services
613 G. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

EXHIBIT B

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY
ELI S. JACOBS
FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
KEVIN ROCHE
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

December 18, 1979

Dear Mr. Pavlick:

When the Commission of Fine Arts approved preliminary designs for the Convention Center, we were not sure that the material samples presented were compatible with the building. We were pleased with the alternate precast concrete you presented at our December meeting and compliment you on that extra effort.

The paving brick, however, was too close to the purple and blue range and could result in a dark, severe setting for the building. Some additional thought to that material, perhaps with a range of warmer-toned brick would be a good idea. It was suggested at the meeting that you might want to coordinate with the P.A.D.C. which is doing a study of paving and sidewalk materials and detailing in the area north of Pennsylvania Avenue. When the selection is made, the Commission or the staff would be happy to join you for an on-site sample inspection.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Charles Pavlick
Liaison Officer
Government of the District of Columbia
Department of General Services
613 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

EXHIBIT C

January 3, 1980

Dear Andy:

The Commission of Fine Arts confirmed its October endorsement of the modified Pershing Park proposals at its December meeting, (CFA 11/1./79-4). In approving the final designs, (CFA 11/1./79-4) we also approved the following materials as an excellent choice: Pink, Castalucci granite by Stoney Creek; Dark, Carnelian granite by Cold Spring. We realize that construction of the part is moving very fast and we will be available to review park furniture and lighting details as they are developed. At the meeting, we requested confirmation that the edge of the pool would be in granite and not concrete.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. W. Anderson Barnes
Executive Director
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation
Suite 1148
425 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

CFA:JCB:hg

EXHIBIT D

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
PHILIP W. BUCHEN — FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY — KEVIN ROCHE
ELI S. JACOBS — EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

December 18, 1979

Dear Andy:

The Commission was pleased to see plans for the Willard progressing and to have an informational briefing by Malcom Holtzman during our December 11, 1979 meeting. The Commission's reaction was enthusiastic and we look forward to reviewing the design in more detail at your convenience.

Sincerely,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. W. Anderson Barnes
Executive Director
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation
425 13th Street, Suite 1148
Washington, D. C. 20004

EXHIBIT E

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman
PHILIP W. BUCHEN
VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY
ELI S. JACOBS
FREDERICK D. NICHOLS
KEVIN ROCHE
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

December 14, 1979

Dear Mrs. Hackel:

The Commission of Fine Arts considered designs for three separate medals at its meeting on December 11, 1979.

The Robert F. Kennedy National Medal was favorably reviewed and unanimously approved. Both artists should be commended for their work. (CFA 11/12/79-3)

The Commission is happy to say that the resubmission of the Transatlantic Ballonist Medal was received with the approval and the appreciation of its members for the efforts made by NASA and your agency in strengthening the composition. (CFA 11/12/79-8)

The Commission reviewed the Hubert H. Humphrey Medal with some reservations. The members were unable to approve the design primarily because the lettering on the obverse of the proposed medal seemed to crowd the portrait, which in itself displayed a greater severity of character than popularly associated with the former Senator. (CFA 11/12/79-7)

We will be happy to work with representatives of your agency in reviewing further designs for the Humphrey medal. Our next meeting is January 8, 1980, should you wish time scheduled for this matter.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mrs. Stella Hackel
Director of the Mint
501 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20220

EXHIBIT F